Appeal to Ike on Castro, P. 3

British Press, Right to Left, Unlike Ours, Welcomes Nuclear Test Compromise at Geneva. Page 2

I. F. Stone's Weekly

VOL. VIII, NO. 12 MARCH 28, 1960 WASHINGTON, D. C. 15 CENTS

The New Russian Offer and the Enemies of Peace

The enemies of peace are in full cry here on the heels of the Russian nuclear test moratorium offer at Geneva. All the main organs of government concerned, the Pentagon, the Atomic Energy Commission, and the State Department are engaged in poisoning the public mind on the subject through what might justly be called their *mis*information offices. To watch what is happening is to feel oneself living among madmen, determined to thwart every opportunity which may draw mankind back from the abyss.

Though public official statements wait for a decision by the President, the private briefings which fuel the press began to generate suspicion and derision (see adjoining box) within a few hours of the announcement in Geneva. The No. 1 misrepresentation is that tests underground of a weapon smaller than the Hirshima-type bomb cannot be detected, and that a moratorium on these smaller tests would depend only on "word of honor." The *AP* from Geneva March 20 quoted unnamed "Western scientists" as saying that shots below this 20 kiloton threshold are" incapable of detection with present scientific techniques" and Dana Adams Schmidt reported from Washington in the *New York Times* March 21 that tests below that size "cannot be detected if carried out underground."

As Far As Antarctica

It is true that one cannot be certain of detecting the smallest shots and that it may be more difficult to distinguish them from earthquakes. But they can and often are detected at great distances. An authoritative article in the *Journal of Geophysical Research* last October on the so-called Hardtack series of underground tests reports that they were recorded in this country by temporary seismograph stations up to distances of nearly 2400 miles "and records from all over the world were available from regular seismograph stations." The transcript of the technical conference at Geneva last winter shows that the Air Force seismologist Carl Romney brought in records on the Hardtack series from more than 90 stations, including Sweden and Japan. The largest of these shots, Blanca, was 19 kilotons, but the second largest Logan was only 5 kilotons, and the third in size, Tamalpais, was only 72 *tons* (i.e. .072 kiloton). The transcript of the Geneva technical discussions shows that seismic records of both the 19 kiloton and the 5 kiloton shots were obtained in the Soviet Union at the Tiksi station in the epicentral distance of 6,890 kilometers (about 4300 miles away) and that the 19 kiloton shot was registered as far away as the Soviet seismic station in Antarctica at the epicentral distance of 16,250 kilometers or more than 10,000 miles.*

The grid system to be established in accordance with the decisions reached at the 1958 Geneva conference would place control posts across the Soviet Union at still undetermined but much smaller distances than these. These posts would detect many of the smaller shots. (It will be recalled that the 1.7 kiloton Rainier shot was detected 2400 miles away in Alaska.) Any attempt to violate the moratorium on shots below 20 kilotons would be risky. As Humphrey said in a speech prepared for delivery to the Senate Wednesday afternoon "the United States would have at least three ways in which a small test conducted secretly might be discovered, (1) the control posts being established in the Soviet Union would detect many signals even in the low range; (2) the United States would still have available to it its highly sensitive national stations and stations in other countries which furnish data on earthquakes and possible nuclear explosions; and (3) our regular intelligence sources would furnish information on whether suspicious activity was going on in certain areas."

Slow Careful Study

"Washington, March 10—The State Dept. said today that the Soviet Union's conditional acceptance of President Eisenhower's proposal for a limited nuclear test ban would be studied 'very carefully'. . . . Privately, however, officials expressed the view that the Soviet offer had the earmarks of what has come to be known here as 'the Saturday special'—a seemingly large concession designed to catch the Sunday headlines."

—E. W. Kenworthy, writing at the State Dept. Sat. afternoan March 19, a few hours after the Soviet offer was made public in Geneva, New York Times, Mar. 20.

"The more experts here study the new Soviet proposal the more skeptical they seem to become about it."

—John M. Hightower, Associated Press, writing at the State Dept. Sunday afternoon Mar. 20.

"Among Administration disarmament specialists there was little optimism that the Soviet proposal represented an important break in the stalemate that has descended upon the 17-month old test-ban conference."

—John W. Finney, writing in Washington Monday afternoon, Mar. 21, New York Times, Mar. 22.

Additional Safeguard Available

There is an additional safeguard available. Although Senator Humphrey said "on-site inspection would not be allowed during the moratorium below the threshold", there is no reason why the quota of veto-free inspections should not include

(*Continued on Page Two*)

***A report in the Carnegie Institution Annual for '55-'56 on experiments in Alaska in 1955 with non-nuclear underground shots showed that explosions as small as one ton (one-thousandth of a kiloton) could be detected within 400 kilometers of 250 miles.**

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Anderson and Holifield Rush Into Print to Help Block A Testing Agreement

The Veto Free Inspection Quota Could Also Be Used on Suspect Smaller Shots

(*Continued from Page One*)

shots below as well as above the threshold during the moratorium period. Indeed, with the actual text of the Russian offer still kept secret here as we go to press, there seems to be some confusion on this vital point. My curiosity was piqued by an Associated Press dispatch from Geneva in the *Baltimore Sun* March 21 which reported, "The Russians said they even would accept some form of control over these small underground tests, but did not define the inspection machinery they had in mind." In one informed quarter, where a summary of the Russian offer was available, I was told it would allow use of the inspection quota below as well as above the threshold. I have since verified this at the State Department.

Humphrey Suggested This First

Except for Senator Humphrey's, no voice here is raised for negotiation. The Russian offer, to accept the Geneva grid system but with a moratorium on the smaller shots while joint work is pursued to improve detection methods, is the same compromise suggested by Humphrey last Fall and by the British at Geneva a few weeks ago. The case for this compromise is so clear that only in a capital as wacky as ours would it be questioned. Let us spell it out simply. 1. It would take two to three years to set up the Geneva grid system anyway. 2. The Berkner panel report to the White House last spring outlined a program of research which would in three years time improve the grid system to the point where it could identify 90 percent of "unidentified events" down to the 5 kiloton range. 3. So by the time the grid system is installed, the means for improving it will be at hand. Why not then agree on the grid system and pursue its improvement jointly? Why let the precious opportunity pass?

Opposition comes now simply from those who want testing and the arms race to go on. They make up a formidable company which can be defeated only by an upsurge of public feeling. The fierceness of the opposition is a barometer of how close we are to a reasonable compromise at Geneva. The enemies of peace are already digging in to defeat any treaty in the Senate. The Joint Committee on Atomic Energy will be the first hurdle, and its 18 members now stand as firmly as tin soldiers behind the AEC. Anderson and Holifield, the senior Democrats, dashed into print in opposition to the Geneva compromise with as little evidence of sober consideration as their youngest and most frenetic colleague, Hosmer (*R.*) of California. The Committee allowed McCone and Teller to use a neatly stage-managed hearing on "peaceful uses" last Tuesday as a sounding board against an agreement.

By some accident of casting, an independent character got into the act. Henry D. Smyth of Princeton was one of the original and most renowned members of the AEC in the days before it became a home for retired big business men. Dr. Smyth warned the Joint Committee (while Dr. Teller wriggled angrily in a seat behind him) to make "very sure that our peaceful uses of atomic explosions will not become a disruptive force in our international relations." This is, of course, what McCone and Teller hope to make them. What a pity there is no longer any such voice in opposition on the AEC! Or on the Joint Committee.

Even Snail's Pace Disarmament Looks Like Break-Neck Speed to Pentagon

"U. S. disarmament policy is increasingly stressing serious proposals instead of propaganda. Behind this stress is the fear that a free-wheeling attractive proposal designed primarily for its propaganda value might be accepted by the Russians. . . .

"The West is cautiously offering a phased and balanced approach with constant stress on the need for careful inspection and control. No time span is mentioned because any realistic one would be too discouraging [the millennium?—IFS]. . . .

"Because the U. S. is seriously interested in disarmament, officials say, it cannot accept the sweeping 4-year panacea the Soviet Union is offering. . . . Once the West embarks on the first stages of an arms-control program, executives would be hard put to slow the slide in defense expenditures to a safe pace.

"And once the spending reaches a low level, it would be difficult to rearm swiftly."

—Washington Star, March 21, "U. S. Shifting Stress in Disarmament Plan."

British Press, Right to Left, Unlike Our Own, Cheers New Test Proposal

"The DAILY HERALD (Labor) says that Mr. Khushchov has broken the deadlock. . . . The hope for peace must not be shattered by the military planners of the U. S. . . . In the same vein, the NEWS CHRONICLE (Liberal) writes: 'Britain is prepared to accept as genuine the Soviet desire to ban nuclear tests; so, also, presumably is the President. But there are voices at the Pentagon which may seek to dissuade him. American defense chiefs are perturbed at the gap between Soviet and U. S. missile development; but if the world must wait until Russia and America regard each other as level in the race towards destruction, the destruction itself may come first.'

"The GUARDIAN (Liberal) says the Russians have at last made a valuable concession to the Western position on nuclear tests. If the U. S. and Britain do not accept it, they will look hypocritical, to say the least. . . . One Conservative newspaper, the DAILY EXPRESS, agrees. . . . Under the heading, 'This Is A Time for Trust', the newspaper says that the peoples of the West expect their governments to respond to the Russian concession in full measure.'

"THE TIMES comments that . . . Russia's willingness to separate smaller underground tests from the rest may have catches in it, but it definitely ranks as progress.

"The DAILY MAIL (Conservative) says that the [British] Medical Council's latest report on fallout comes as a somber warning to the world. The report says that the amount of Strontium 90 in the bones of some children is near the anxiety level; and if such a grim document does not jolt Britain, America and Russia into an agreement to end all nuclear tests then nothing will."

—Today's British Papers, Mar. 21-22, Brit. Inf. Service.

"This provision [for a moratorium on small tests while their monitoring is studied] . . . would be acceptable to Britain but not so palatable to the U. S. If the latter were to refuse it, however, she might well find herself practically isolated at the United Nations and lose much prestige with neutral and non-nuclear countries."

—Leader in the Daily Telegraph (Conservative) Mar. 21.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Cuba's Agrarian Reform Called More Moderate Than Than MacArthur's in Japan

Chile's Students Appeal to Ike Not to Intervene Against Castro

(*Abridged From Appeal to Eisenhower in Santiago*)

"The Cuban revolution is being observed with great attention and even with immense hope by all progressive Latin American sectors, especially the University youth.

"We know and applaud your recent official declaration, serene and respectful, with regard to the self-determination of the Cuban nation, but so different, unfortunately, from the campaign of hatred, calumny and distortion broadcast by the two great North American news agencies.

"The anti-Cuban campaign has revived these days with the complicity of several Latin American countries waiting for the Cuban sugar quota in the North American market. Latin America owes its historical nullification and material poverty to such small and despicable 'statesmen.'

To Destroy Confidence in the U. S.

"Your Excellency: In our modest opinion, North American intervention in Cuba would be 'not only a crime'—the phrase is Talleyrand's—but 'an immense stupidity.' It would be an unforgiveable abuse which would mortally wound the moral and psychological basis of the Inter-American System and the collaboration of our nations with yours. You would have the interested applause of the small circle of individuals who encourage you to intervene because this is convenient for their own self-interest, but you would lose forever the confidence of the young, the poor and the decent people of Latin America.

"At the same time, we want you to understand that we do not give unconditional adhesion to the Cuban experiment. We are also discouraged by the length of one man's term in office and the lack of institutions based on the will of the people. But it seems to us that it is plainly immoral to classify the Cuban revolution, its government or its social fulfillments, especially the agricultural reform, as 'communist.' This [Cuban agrarian] reform is more moderate and generous with old land owners than that carried out by General MacArthur in Japan or the agrarian reforms supported by the U. S. in Egypt, Israel, India, Pakistan, Vietnam, etc.

"Why this difference? Is it because seven North American companies on the island own two million hectares of land? If this is a reason for the U. S. to attack Cuba, how can anyone escape the dangerous conclusion that North American private investment is the worst threat to free national decisions and social progress?

"Some time ago, here in Santiago, an Ambassador of the U. S. spoke in such an arrogant way of 'the lesson of Guatemala' that the Chilean Senate condemned it unanimously. Now others apparently prepare 'the lesson of Cuba.' Because your personal and official position, Excellency, has been clear and different, we do not believe that we are lacking respect to you if we add that those why try to give Latin America those 'lessons' of submitting to North American private interests are digging the grave of the Inter-American System and, perhaps, of democracy itself in this part of the Hemisphere.

"There could never be a better time and a better place for the U. S., if it so desired, to demonstrate to the world that which humanity can expect from the nation of Washington, Lincoln and Roosevelt.

"Accept our respectful homage, for the Federation of the Students of Chile."—Eduardo Zuniga, Secretary-General, Patricio Fernandez, President.

Double Standard Cynically Revealed

"The return of Ambassador Bonsal to Cuba . . . would negate the trip by President Eisenhower . . . wipe out the efforts of . . . myself to help people who believe in democracy. This would be . . . catastrophic. . . . We should not appease this little dictator [Castro].

"When the sugar act was last before the Senate, the junior Senator from New Mexico [Mr. Anderson] and I, on the floor of the Senate, had the quotas for the Dominican Republic and Peru reduced . . . in order to make liberal provision for Cuba, because while Cuba at that time had a dictatorship [Batista], the argument was—and I thought it a worthy one—that at least Cuba was cooperating with the U. S. Some persons believe it is very bad if the person who is cooperating is not able to pass a sanitary test."

—Smathers (D. Fla.), U. S. Senate, March 18.

How Our Pet Latin Dictator (Smathers' Friend) Trujillo Treats Property Rights

"It began with a housewife's letter to the editor of El Caribe, the government-controlled newspaper. Butter in local stores, she complained, was of poor quality. Why can't the government do something about it?

"In most countries, such a complaint would go all but unnoticed. But not in the Dominican Republic. For alert business men here [in Ciudad Trujillo] it had a frightening significance: 'The Benefactor'—Dictator Rafael Leonidas Trujillo—was preparing to extend his vast business empire into still another field. . . .

"Soon after the letter's publication, new sanitary regulations were announced to cover . . . butter. One of the few firms already in a position to meet them was La Industria Lechera—a Trujillo enterprise which enjoys a near monopoly in milk distribution in the country's two major cities. No one was surprised, therefore, when the company last month introduced 'Petronilla's butter.

"This incident highlights one of the many devices that have enabled Trujillo to become this country's most powerful, most feared and wealthiest businessman. . . . Government harassment of competitors and government subsidies to Trujillo enterprises are only part of the dictator's business strategy.

"Today there is hardly a profitable business in the land in which The Benefactor doesn't have an interest, direct or indirect. He controls 12 of the country's 16 sugar mills, accounting for two-thirds of the total production. . . . Glass-making, cement, salt, insurance, textiles, meat-packing and bag-making are but a few of the other businesses run by Trujillo and his associates. . . . Some one-time associates, now exiled, estimate his fortune approaches $600,000,000. . . .

"Trujillo's most ambitious business undertaking to date is his sugar venture, launched in 1950. At that time half of the country's 14 mills were American owned. This created some problems but they were soon solved. A barrage of propaganda was aimed at the 'monopolistic international corporations' . . . only one American sugar mill remains in the Dominican Republic. . . ."

—"Tycoon Trujillo" Wall Street Journal on-the-scene report by Staff Member Jos. M. Guilfoyle, March 9.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

That Louisville, Ky., Handyman "Freed" by the Supreme Court Is Again In Jail

Race War Thunderclouds Gather But Our Political Leadership Drifts

A growing sense of solidarity is making itself felt among colored men everywhere. The terrible scene of slaughter outside the police station in Sharpeville, South Africa, will deepen race resentment among American Negroes just as the spreading sit-down strikes in our South will inspire the resistance in Black Africa.

There is a difference between the situation here and there. In South Africa, the Negro is resisting the effort of the Afrikaan white majority to impose new disabilities upon him in the shape of *apartheid*, a stricter form of segregation than any we have known. Here the Southern white majority is fighting a rear-guard action against a massive effort by the Negro to end segregation altogether.

The public policy of the Union of South Africa is to keep the Negro permanently in subordinate status. The public policy of the United States is to give the Negro equality. Unfortunately the theory will only be translated into practice if the Negro pushes for it. He is pushing for it at last.

No Liberation Without Risk

The push has its dangers. For the Negro, the alternative is acquiescence in humiliation; no people's liberation was ever yet won without struggle. For the sympathetic white man, the dangers are regrettable but seem unavoidable given the weak character of our political leadership, and the indifference of the white majority.

The only branch of the government that is facing up to the growing crisis with resolution and responsibility is the Supreme Court. It took two actions last Monday which were, by normal legal standards, quite extraordinary. It agreed to hear an appeal by a group of Negroes against an Alabama redistricting law designed to put virtually all registered Negro voters outside the city of Tuskegee. Hitherto the Court has always refused to interfere with "gerrymandering" laws.

The other action to which we refer was the unanimous opinion by Mr. Justice Black reversing two $10 police court fines for loitering and disorderly conduct. The petitioner, Sam Thompson, was a Louisville, Ky., Negro handyman who committed the unforgiveable crime (in the South) of asking police why he was being arrested and hiring a lawyer.

The Supreme Court normally would never think of hearing an appeal from a $10 fine for a misdemeanor. It showed itself ready again, however, to brush aside conventional legalities to give the Negro justice. It held there was no evidence whatsoever to support his conviction and therefore reversed it as a violation of the due process clause.

Police lawlessness is a familiar affliction for Negroes everywhere, North or South. Sam Thompson in his vendetta with the Louisville police promises to become a folk hero. Unfortunately the vendetta has not ended. When we telephoned Louisville after the Court decision, we found that Mr. Thompson had been arrested no less than 12 times since the convictions reversed by the Court and is even now serving a 6-month sentence for four misdemeanors.

It remains to be seen whether, even with white friends and the American Civil Liberties Union's support, a Negro can ultimately defeat a police force determined to show him the dangers of "talking back."

That's All We Want 'Em to Be

"Some Negroes and a few whites accused Sheriff Warren Johnson of harassing and mistreating Negroes. . . . Mr. Johnson attributed the criticism to politics. He said there was no difficulty for those among the minority race 'that want to be niggers, and that's all we want 'em to be.'"

—"Negroes in Black Belt Say Vote Law Won't Aid Them," story by Claude Sitton, N. Y. Times, Mar. 18.

New Test of Un-American Committee

The Court last Monday agreed to hear the appeal of Arthur M. McPhaul from a nine months jail sentence for contempt of the House Un-American Activities Committee. At a Detroit hearing eight years ago he refused to produce the records of the Civil Right Congress. His petition pleaded that the government failed to prove he had the records or to show their pertinency, and that the subpoena was so all-inclusive as to constitute unlawful search and seizure.

Extra Copies This Issue Available at $3 A Hundred for Wider Distribution

I. F. Stone's Weekly, 5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W. Washington 15, D. C.

Please renew (or enter) my sub for the enclosed $5:*

Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

3/28/60

Enter gift sub for $2 (6 mos.) or $4 (1 yr.) additional:

(To) Name .....

Street .....

City .....**Zone**.....**State**.....

Shall we send gift announcement? Yes ☐ No ☐

I. F. Stone's Weekly
5618 Nebraska Ave., N. W.
Washington 15, D. C.
NEWSPAPER

Entered as Second Class Mail Matter Washington, D. C. Post Office

Chicago Area Readers: IFS will speak on "The Supreme Court and the Un-American Activities Committee" at Dinner April 2, Midland Hotel, Chicago, in Honor of the 70th birthday of Famed Civil Libertarian Lawyer, Pearl Hart.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED